DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 956 PS 006 598

AUTHOR	Siedman, Eileen
TITLE	Day Care in Vermont (Excerpts from the Introduction and the Executive Summary).
INSTITUTION	Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc., Washington, D.C.; Leadership Inst. for Community Development, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C. Office of Program Development.
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	17p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc., 1401 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005 (Child Care Bulletin No. 5, $0.75)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Bulletins; *Child Care; *Day Care Programs; *Program Evaluation; *State Licensing Boards; *Statewide Planning; Systems Analysis
IDENTIFIERS	Federal Assistance Plan; *Vermont

ABSTRACT

A pretest of the Vermont model of the Family Assistance Plan to provide statewide day care services for working parents is presented as to summary findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Facilitating factors towards the delivery of quality child care services were the day care licensing procedure, the focus on child development, talented people who developed new ways of doing things at all levels, Vermonters' candor and informality, the use of the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements, and the newness of the program. Inhibiting factors were that there was no income maintenance pretest, no one in charge, funding insecurity, economic enphasis, unrealistic eligibility requirements and reimbursement rates, separation of planning and operations, the plan was not a plan, inexperience with Federal ralations, no information system, and top-down decisions. Broad problem areas of the operating system were related to the absence of reliable, timely, useful information about almost every subject, as well as dissatisfaction with the decision-making process, and finally to the smoldering issue of developmental versus custodial care. Recommendations relate to definitions, separation of services and resources, State characteristics and basic elements of child care, information, statewide coordination, reimbursement, financial management, child care providers, food, health, and Community Coordinated Child Care (4-C). (DB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Day Care in Vermont

(Excerpts from the Introduction and the Executive Summary)

child care bulletin number 5

ED 078956

PS 006598

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

FROM

DAY CARE IN VERMONT

An Evaluation of the Vermont
Model FAP Child Care
Service System

Eileen Siedman
Leadership Institute for
Community Development
(LICD)

Cover Design: Tim Kenney

© Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc.
Washington, D.C. 1973

Publication No. A-5

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc.
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

INTRODUCTION TO THE CHILD CARE BULLETIN SERIES

Today, there is no longer a lack of materials on Day Care and Child Development. On the contrary, there is an impressive amount of materials now in print. Unfortunately, these publications are often inaccessible, or when they are available, they are frequently voluminous. Research and information retrieval then becomes an onerous task. There is absolutely no need to burden people who are involved in child care with difficulties of procuring inaccessible materials or with materials of unmanageable proportions.

There is a need for concise, readily available materials. These Bulletins are a response to that need. They synopsize a portion of the child care resources presently being developed and disseminated by the Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc., under Office of Economic Opportunity Grant No. 30079.

Each Bulletin, though developed independently, is closely interrelated with the others, by means of cross-references found in the text. The references to other Bulletins are provided with the intent of minimizing the built-in bias that is present in any study. We hope that this method will provide the reader with a truer perspective of current critical issues.

For the discriminating reader who requires more specific information, the complete, original publication from which this Bulletin was gleaned may be consulted in any of the following repositories:

- The fifty State Libraries
- The fifty State Offices of Economic Opportunity
- The ten Federal Regional Committee Headquarters
- The Library of Congress
- and the Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc., Library.

The perspectives and conclusions found in this Bulletin do not necessarily represent the policies of either the Office of Economic Opportunity/Office of Program Development or the Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc.

We wish to express our gratitude to the Council Board's Advisory Committee, Mrs. Mary Dublin Keyserling, Dr. Leonard Mestas, and Mrs. Gwen Morgan, for their guidance and review in the preparation of these bulletins.

THE EDITORS
November, 1972

INTRODUCTION

Why Vermont? That seemed to be the standard question each time someone heard about this study for the first time. The question was generally followed with skeptical comments about population characteristics since Vermont's folks were predominantly rural whites who lived all over the state, in and around tiny towns and villages. As one state official put it, "Vermont is a medium sized city spread over a 10,000 mile terrain." What possible value, then, could a pretest of a national day care system have for the rest of the country when Vermont was so "different," they asked, as if state characteristics rather than national policies were the issue. And, in fact, Vermont was not "typical." But neither were New York, Alaska, West Virginia, Alabama, Connecticut, Hawaii, or Ohio. For each of the fifty states had its own characteristics, geography, traditions and population mix, and none of those factors turned out to be significant research variables for two important reasons.

First, this was a system study—an intensive examination of the way federal and state resources were used to provide statewide day care services for working parents under a proposed welfare reform plan.

Since federally funded programs were wrapped in identical boxes and tied with the same red tape, no matter which state received them, state and local differences of type and degree were important factors but national administrative regulations were the same, so Vermont was as good as any other place to pretest the model FAP day care system. The forms and controls were standard and the new rules were designed for a national program.

Second, the factor of ubiquitous humanity presupposes that people are people, regardless of how they look, where they live or their source of income. Given that, the service delivery human needs in Vermont could be equated with those in the rest of the country so that judgments about "how well" to meet those needs were considered transferrable to other states.

The dilemma, of course, was first to learn "what really happened" when Vermont was funded to plan, organize and operate a model day care delivery system in the context of the proposed Family Assistance Plan, and second, to find a way to assess "how well" the model functioned to achieve its objectives. In the final analysis, achievement of this program's goals should have been measured by whether or not its clientele public was better off, worse off or unchanged as a result of the program activity, but this

evaluation stopped short of that the Vermont model FAP child care service system was expected to become a preliminary state implementation model when the Family Assistance Plan became law. In conception, it was to implement a model FAP child care plan. However, Vermont's Operations Plan was not a work plan for a service delivery system except as it specified FAP eligibility requirements and financial controls. The Plan seemed to assume that having made money available within boundaries and constraints, supply and demand factors would permit a delivery system to "happen." Nevertheless, when the FAP pretest brought statewide money and attention to Vermont's day care needs, FAP resources became the basis for organizing and operating a statewide day care system which then generated new needs for policy and procedure in order to function.

Overall, the prestest appeared to demonstrate that Vermont parents would use day care resources, if available, so they could take jobs or employment for training. However, because of informational deficiencies, there was little reliable data from the Vermont pretest to directly associate those working parents with the FAP-related activities of the pretest. As a measure of success, the pretest brought day care to Vermont and some expectations that, if jobs were available, welfare recipients and other low income people who needed child care could go to work. Perhaps the most serious misconception of the planners, however, lay in their assumption that a statewide human service system could be started from scratch without consideration for the complexities of service delivery and the potential consequences of conflicting values, such as custodial versus developmental child care.

It is important to note here that our investigation found no recalcitrant bureaucrats or other blameworthy types. The data are clear that nearly everyone involved in the project was eager for success and deeply committed to producing quality child care for working parents. Conflicts which surfaced developed around different perceptions to the ultimate goal: day care for children's sake or day care to meet economic needs?

For a further discussion of economic and quality issues of developmental child care, see Child Care Bulletin No. 2, subject: Feasibility Report and Design of an Impact Study of Day Care (The Center for the Study of Public Policy).

The summary findings, conclusions and recommendations which follow suggest that these two objectives are not mutually exclusive if planned for as equally important elements of a total delivery system.

PLANNING PROCESS PROBLEMS

The basic problem in the development of the planning process seemed to flow from the traditional pattern of developing and managing federally funded programs from multiple funding sources, each with its own guidelines and regulations. Even though the proposed FAP legislation provided the basic framework, actual funding was fragmented and tied to existing legislation. Administratively, this meant that various different units of the federal government each had a vested interest in the Vermont pretest and were involved in decisions, one way or another.

Lack of agreement on objectives, a wide range of expectations and polarization around the custodial vs. developmental child care controversy added to the planning problems.

Administrative and communication problems resulted from the lack of adequate information and decision-making systems, a common complaint being that no one was in charge. Finally, the baseline survey done by Mathematica, Inc. was originally intended to provide data for an income maintenance plan, not for a day care system. As a result, much of that data was not as relevant as it might have been.

TOWARDS THE DELIVERY OF QUALITY CHILD CARE SERVICES

Facilitating Factors

- *Vermont Day Care Licensing Procedure.* Despite its problems with not enough staff, it provided a good foundation for building a stable, quality day care system.

For a brief overview of day care licensing, see the preface (Licensing: What It Is and What It Isn't) to Child Care Bulletin No. 4, subject: A Survey of State Day Care Licensing Requirements (CONSERCO).

- *4-C concept.* With its focus on child development, it helped facilitate the establishment of a quality day care service by off-setting the heavy emphasis on money management and eligibility requirements placed on the operators by the state.

- *Individual creative energies.* Talented people developed new ways of doing things at all levels. In several cases, their energies were directed to the development and operation of a quality day care service despite federal and state guidelines and procedures which were directed toward economic objectives only.

• *Vermont's candor and informality.* The people's concern for children and welfare reform combined with a willingness and flexibility to shift gears frequently as necessary, contributed to the promise of a quality day care system.

• *Use of the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements.* They provided standards and the ingredients for a quality day care service. While Vermont needed to build a system in order to comply with them, the Requirements could be used as a basic policy guide in structuring a child-centered delivery system.

• *Newness.* Vermont had the opportunity to start a new program from scratch without the kind of baggage which comes from doing things "the right (or wrong) way" for years.

Inhibiting Factors

• *No income maintenance pretest.* The day care system was originally conceived as part of a larger pretest and suffered from attempting to live with the constraints imposed by the FAP concept without, at the same time, having the advantages of its potential benefits.

• *"No one in charge".* Shifts of personnel and agency responsibility, combined with inadequate information and decision-making processes, created the impression that no one was in charge when answers were hard to get or were unsatisfactory; further compounded by passing decision-making to the 4-C and operating levels without a framework of statewide policies.

• *Funding insecurity.* The tentative nature of a pretest with its dependence on temporary "Special Projects Funds" created an atmosphere of insecurity which permeated the program at every level, but hit hardest at low-income care providers.

• *Economic emphasis.* The heavy emphasis on FAP fiscal controls distorted the overall design of the system and created unnecessary obstacles which delayed its development.

• *Unrealistic eligibility requirements and reimbursement rates.* These FAP requirements became a device to screen out rather than screen in clientele because they considered neither net income nor actual costs of providing the service even though the state was required to comply with the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements standards of service.

• *Separation of planning and operations.* The FAP versus quality child care schism was exemplified in the physical separation of the FAP planning staff from the Day Care Operations staff. The logical outcome of that sectarian relationship was a two-track day care system which tried to provide a difficult and expensive human service while dependent upon multiple funding sources, which were designed for other purposes.

PS 006598

- *The Plan was not a plan.* As originally agreed, Vermont was to produce a model plan as an implemental device for organizing and operating a statewide day care system for FAP eligible families. The plan, however, proved to be an excellent exposition of FAP objectives without the necessary elements for attaining child care objectives.

- *Inexperience with federal relations.* State level decision-makers were, for the most part, inexperienced in the ways of federal-state relations so that some federal decisions or requirements that might have been challenged or modified (as being of questionable benefit to Vermont) were accepted as inevitable, regardless of their consequences.

- *No information system.* Crisis management was one outgrowth of the lack of information which had a riple effect on all aspects of the pretest. No machinery was developed to collect, select, store, use and distribute information for decisions or action. Without appropriate information, there was no way to anticipate problems, evaluate actions or assess the consequences of policy decisions. Training and technical assistance, as information disseminating methods, should have been integral elements of a statewide information network.

- *Top-down decisions.* Crucial policy decisions were made in Washington despite a stated FAP objective to encourage state and local option. In analyzing Vermont's decision-making processes, it seemed that difficult action decisions (e.g., adding children with a reduced funding level) were transferred to the 4-Cs and sites while conceptual abstractions (e.g., adult-child ratios) and critical funding decisions were made by state and federal officials without feedback from the field.

BROAD PROBLEM AREAS OF THE OPERATING SYSTEM

A. Information

Information is the most essential ingredient of any system and had the lowest priority in Vermont's pretest. Over and over again, all sorts of problems could be traced to the absence of reliable, timely, useful information about nearly every subject.

Because of the special importance of information as central to the day care system, the LICD investigation focused on how information was obtained, selected, stored, used and disseminated. Starting with the Baseline Survey, Vermont attempted to collect information about day care needs and resources. Except for the field data collection related to the Mathematica study, however, we learned that decision-makers did not systematically attempt to obtain information from the field until well into the second year of the pretest. Feedback information would have been useful not only for

obtaining current assessments of client needs and resource inventories, but, equally important, it could have been useful in determining how well the system was working. Most of the regular feedback from sites to 4-C to state consisted of complaints or crises which needed immediate action, but no central record was kept of such transactions either for operating decisions or for long-range planning.

For example, field people at the state level each worked independently and kept their own records and files. At the same time, 4-C committees did not maintain records with a tabulated summary of the eligibility status of the families participating in their day care programs.

This lack of specific data may have stemmed from a feeling that the eligibility status of day care families was not a 4-C responsibility, or it may have reflected the absence of a statewide information system useful to the 4-Cs as a planning and evaluation tool to help gauge the extent of the 4-C impact on the FAP and Title IV-A target population.

Recognizing the problem, Vermont OCD, early in FY 1972, began to develop a formal management information system which was still in the trial and error stage during the closing period of the LICD study. However, one 4-C leader complained that "they did not understand" OCD forms #101, 102 and 103 and had been waiting for "someone from OCD to explain them." This leader said that once they understood these forms, they would "know the information you are asking for."[1]

Data kept by the day care operators also reflected a lack of uniformity in record-keeping and reporting. Expenditure and income records were seen as "most useful" to the operators, but were not centrally collected or used for area-wide or statewide decisions, and not all the required records were useful. For example, the food service reimbursement program required that highly detailed control records be maintained at each site for at least three years, under Department of Agriculture regulations. LICD staff could find no rationale for the method used to control food services at the operating level, particularly since no one in Vermont was interviewed with responsibility for reviewing them or using them. We were told, however, that "someone from the Department of Agriculture once looked at a center's records." Control of surplus commodities required records which provided specific information to show dates and amounts of commodities received, how much of each commodity was used during the month, and the balance on hand at the close of each reporting period.

We received the general impression of a one way information system, top down with no method to test whether or not the "message" had been received, understood or correctly applied. For example, some sites con-

sistently submitted incomplete or inaccurate billing reports, but we found no evidence of a system to collect information to identify the source of the problems. At another level, several state officials each thought another of them exercised day care budget control when, in fact, no one did. At the same time, site level people were expected to comply with complicated regulations on the faulty assumption that they had copies of them, had read and understood them, Knew what to do in order to comply with them, or knew where to turn for assistance.

The point here is that there was no systematic flow of information which could be tapped and adjusted as needed. Many of the problems which seemed to defy resolution, when traced to their source, revealed that information was missing, was incomplete, was incomprehensive, was inaccurate or was late. Consequently, some 4-C leaders and site operators attempted to develop policies and procedures to meet their own needs for firm statements of fact, whether or not they meshed with "official" positions.

In the absence of official guidelines and policies, one 4-C leader began to write a step-by-step procedure for organizing and developing a 4-C Day Care program, then discontinued the effort when the State OCD staff said they were developing such a manual. One 4-C was developing functional forms to be used for specific 4-C activities and functions. Another 4-C had developed a verbal procedure for determining eligibility, billing, reimbursement and site approval. Still another 4-C developed a "Caretaker checklist, out of the necessity to create order out of chaos," and because it helped the 4-C staff "to provide information to upgrade the quality of care." Another 4-C developed a new face sheet for the monthly billing, designed to meet its need for health and billing records.

Overall, the Vermont referral system was so informal that referrals depended on personal knowledge of available resources and ability to obtain them. In only a few situations were forms used.

There was no uniform procedure which all day care directors followed in certifying the eligibility of day care families. Without adequate information, instruction and technical assistance, it was unrealistic for planners to expect day care providers to handle the certification of eligibility.

It is interesting to note that both the day care directors and state officials who had helped the operators with eligibility and fee computation reports isolated the major problems as "interpretation of the rules ".

As further evidence of the pervasive nature of this problem, correspondence from state to federal officials sometimes contained the same pleas for

"urgent decisions" on policy matters that appeared in correspondence for 4-C leaders to the state. Long lists of questions needing answers moved back and forth from Montpelier to Washington as the need for information grew in direct proportion to the complexities of the program. Stridency came through occasionally as patience wore thin from long delayed responses, from Washington to Vermont and on down the line.

Semantics presented some problems, too. Unlicensed day care sites were called "Caretakers" in Vermont, but some of them were confused with satelliite homes and other types of licensed homes. Nearly everyone at the state and 4-C level referred to day care facilities as "centers", further confusing communications because of the several distinctive categories of day care providers which included two types of centers, one of them licensed for thirty or more children and the other licensed for less than thirty children. In order to handle these distinctions, LICD consistently identified all day care providers as "sites."

LICD findings verified the importance and impact of Vermont's information processes on "how well" the day care system operated. There was no part of the system unaffected by the availability or absence of accurate, timely, useful information, but some elements of the system were more dependent on information and hence more visibly affected, such as compliance enforcement and decision-making. Vermont's movement toward automation and a management information system indicated an awareness of the problem.

The state's characteristic informality could have been an important feedback asset if used as an integral element of a statewide information system. LICD's use of the question, "If you had the power, how would you change the day care system?" demonstrated the value of providing an opportunity for the real experts—the people who were the system—to be heard.

Experience had demonstrated that when there is a void in the system, such as a lack of readily available information in a useful form, mistrust, suspicion and conflicts develop. The well-worn credibility gap is one other consequence. Freedom of informality is possible only when people trust one another because they know what is expected of them and have a pretty clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities in relation to one another. Reliable information is the foundation of such trust.

B. Decision Making

Decision making in the FAP day care pretest was usually top-down with respect to every aspect of importance except parental option to select the

day care providers of their choice. Even then, unless alternative sites were available and readily accessible, that option, too, may have been illusory.

At the same time, certain policy questions which could only be decided at the state level were left either unresolved or uncommunicated while regional 4-Cs and day care providers groped for answers, took action on their own or quietly gave up.

In general, LICD investigators found significant dissatisfaction with the decision-making process at every level of inquiry. There was frustration over a lack of specific and timely answers to operating as well as policy questions. This problem touched people everywhere in the program, from federal through state to 4-C and day care sites. In some cases, we found that decisions had been made but had not been adequately communicated. In most cases, however decisions could not be identified firmly so that they could be acted upon, particularly at the 4-C and site levels.

Parent participation in decision-making, an avowed objective in the HEW/Vermont contract, was built into the Operations Plan as representation on advisory and policy boards, with some appeals procedures for parents (and others) with grievances over equitable representation. The data show, however, that most parent involvement, however limited, resulted from interaction with operators and staff at the sites and somewhat less frequently through formally structured boards. This finding points to the need to reassess prevailing perceptions of parent involvement and to encourage such activities to evolve in ways best suited to the parents.

Parent involvement is briefly covered in Child Care Bulletin No. 3, subject: A Study in Child Care (Abt.).

In summary, then, decisions were made at every level by everyone in the system, with greater or lesser consequences. In the absence of useful information, many operating decisions were responses to crises. And there was no evidence of systematic dceision-making which sought and considered information from the field.

C. Community Coordinated Chid Care (4-C)

Theoretically, the concept of community coordinated child care implies a system of local development and control of child care. Vermont's 4-C system became a response to funding sources with all their requirements and regulations. The bureaucratic spiderweb of federal-state financial controls left little initiative to local 4-C committees which couldn't provide day care services without the public funds. !ndeed, the area 4-Cs existed only because

they provided a layer of decentralized administration between state government and the day care providers.

Overall, our investigation revealed serious frustrations among the 4-C leadership over the smoldering issue of developmental versus custodial care. There seemed to be consensus that 4-C committees were designed to provide services to children, not families, and that federal funding from whatever source should be, primarily, a means to that end. This point of view was confirmed in the responses we received to questions concerning families. In every case, 4-C leaders told LICD investigators that they kept their records and organized their activities around children rather than families and, therefore, could not respond specifically to our questions about the FAP impact on families or parent employment factors.

There was also consensus on the need for quality day care for children of working parents and agreement with the overall goals of a welfare reform strategy which would provide employment alternatives to a dole. Nevertheless, the 4-C leadership agreed that day care eligibility should include children's needs, in addition to the economic needs of families. 4-C leaders described their position as being "caught in the middle" between their own priorities of quality child care and compliance with FAP and Title IV-A funding sources in order to stay in business.

Regardless of all the other dimensions of Vermont's FAP day care pretest, what may turn out to be a most significant factor was implied in the information that about half of the sample sites operated out of private homes. Vermont's pretest challenged the assumption that quality child care was somehow related to centers or institutional facilities, rather than a product of human interaction and imaginative use of resources. If the Vermont experiment was disappointing to some, that reaction may have been more a consequence of unrealized potential than imperfect achievement.

THE OPERATING SYSTEM

Summary and Recommendations

1. *Definitions*

(a) "Child care" rather than "day care" should be used to describe such services since working parents, and especially low-income parents, work nights, weekends, split shifts, holidays and other irregular hours. This broader designation is more likely to encourage the development and availability of 24 hour service to meet the real needs of working parents.

(b) Federal, state and local officials should work together through the HEW Office of Child Development to *define "quality child care" and its*

actual cost so that uniform national standards of quality and costs can be established to avoid discrimination against some children because of inadequate, unequal or unavailable resources.

2. *Separation of services and resources*

Child care service delivery should be organized and operated to meet the needs of children and their families. Resources should be treated as means to achieve that end. Therefore, it is recommended that *child care services* be separated from *child care resources* by developing and operating

(a) an action plan to deliver stable, quality *child care service* which is child-centered and meets the needs of the clientele population including work/training referrals for parents and the provision of ancillary services to the program.

(b) an action plan to identify, locate, obtain and use all the *necessary resources* to support the service delivery plan. Each child care provider should be required to develop and use an annualized budget to ensure sufficient funds for quality care. Resources could include:

(1) federal, state and local public funds;

(2) state and local child service agencies, both public and private;

(3) private funds;

(4) volunteer services;

(5) donations of facilities, equipment, supplies and food;

(6) shared resources with other related activities, such as Head Start, Model Cities day care, Parent-Child Centers, etc.

(7) Employer and labor union contributions;

(8) Centralized purchasing or borrowing.

The appendix of Child Care Bulletin No. 7, subject: Day Care Survey 1970-71 (Westat) contains detailed information on cost and quality issues of child care. See also Child Care Bulletin No. 3, cited above.

3. *State characteristics and basic elements of child care*

Each state's child care service system should meet its own needs by taking its community characteristics into consideration when establishing policies and procedures to incorporate the following *basic elements* into a statewide child care system:

- children
- parents or guardians
- a statement of objectives

- a time-phased work plan
- money
- child care staff
- facilities (homes, centers, institutions), equipment, supplies
- food
- administrative support services
- ancillary services (i.e., health, transportation, social, educational)
- operational systems which include planning and evaluation
- standards of quality
- information
- controls or accountability
- time
- community resources

4. *Information*

A comprehensive *information* network should become the core of the child care service system since every aspect of the program depends on information. Such a network would ensure feedback from persons in the service system and would permit participative decision making by providing opportunities to be heard. Computerized management information systems are only one type of data source. Structured personal contacts, such as the type used for the LICD study, may prove to be more productive for feedback than written communications.

The state should develop and distribute child care policies and procedures through a systematic network which reaches all levels of the operating system in a useful form. One element of such a network could be a child care newsletter to facilitate dissemination of useful statewide information. To be most effective, such a publication should receive input from all over the state and contain legislative and instructional news as well as resource information about child care-related organizations and agencies.

5. *Statewide coordination*

Each child care provider should have a single coordinative state agency point of contact as its source of information and technical assistance concerning child development standards, fiscal management, policy, procedure and other state-wide responsibilities.

This could be accomplished through:

(a) better and more extensive use of existing programs by integrating them at the state level;

(b) cost savings through centralized purchasing of supplies, food and equipment;

(c) statewide training programs which respond to on-the-job needs of child care providers.

6. *Reimbursement*

States should reimburse parents, not child care providers, but set a reasonable ceiling on fees to ensure compliance with quality standards and to prevent exploitation by those few providers who might seek to expand profits at the expense of the children. This procedure could drastically reduce administrative costs and still permit administrative technical assistance to those providers who want it. This could be done several ways:

(a) provide FAP eligible families with money (not vouchers) to purchase the services of their choice rather than reimbursing the providers through state controlled mechanisms.

(b) use *net* tax figures to determine ability to repay.

(c) establish a revolving fund for parents at the local level to provide child care on credit by means of interest free loans, to be repaid to the revolving fund when the borrower is able.

Child Care Bulletin No. 2, cited above, presents a variety of funding mechanisms and reimbursement procedures. The appendix of Child Care Bulletin No. 7, cited above, has a brief section on funding.

7. *Financial Management*

Certification of eligibility and payment reimbursement should be the responsibility of a single state agency. The federal social security system offers a viable example because its function is entirely fiscal and removes such decisions from the client/provider relationship. This approach is the most economical for both planning and operating and can lead to substantial savings in administrative costs by means of:

(a) simplifying and improving fiscal management by separating service delivery from financial resources in planning, budgeting, operating and evaluating;

(b) simplifying and improving administrative procedures to eliminate unnecessary, inappropriate and uneconomical fiscal controls which frequently cost more money than they save;

(c) better use of staff time for both child care services and fiscal management. People who work with children should not have to be responsible for records and reports as well.

8. *Child care providers*

Child care providers should be required to meet *personal and operational standards* before having children entrusted to them. This will require realistic standards, appropriate preparation and an effective compliance system which facilitates rather than inhibits service delivery without sacrificing quality child care.

9. *Food*

Providing *food* to the child care system could become a source of economic growth for local farmers. Rather than bringing surplus commodities into poor rural states, such as Vermont, this market could provide nutritious fresh food at reasonable cost.

10. *Health*

Child care systems should make provision for children with special health problems. Health-related factors have ramifications for adult-child ratios, enrollee attendance and the ability of parents to work or receive training.

11. *4-C*

The national 4-C office in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare should help to clarify the roles and responsibilities of state and local 4-C committees.

The 4-C mechanism has a broker/ombudsman potential for child care but will require independent funding in order to play that role effectively. 4-C organizations in various states and regions should join forces to explore and strengthen their roles as child advocates, regardless of child care funding sources.